



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/085,635	02/28/2002	Wing-Cheong Tang	5181-89200	5376	
7:	590 08/09/2004		EXAM	INER	
Jeffrey C Hood Meyertons Hood Kivlin Kowert & Goetzel PC			CHEN, PO WEI		
P O Box 398	a Kiviin Kowen & Go	etzei PC	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Austin, TX 78	8767-0398		2676 [] DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/085,635	TANG ET AL.			
navious y notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Po-Wei (Dennis) Chen	2676			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dahave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three models.	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. I 36(a) and the appropriate ex fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee ttension fee under (2) as set forth in		
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	-	-			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9 ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:	Wand	C. Be	ela		
	, (au				

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/085,635

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments have been fully considered but they are not pursuasive. The Applicant argues prior art does not disclose limitation of "storing final x,y values for each respective edge of the polygon, wherein, for each respective edge, said storing final x,y values comprises storing the interpolated x,y values for non-end points of the respective edge, and said storing final x,y values comprises storing the computed initial vertex x,y values for each of the end points of the respective edge". However, this has been addressed in the office action filed April 22, 2004. Furthermore, the Applicant argues references utilize less precision calculation than the claimed invention and references do not address problem of accumulated errors. However, these limitations are not in the claim.